



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,592	10/01/2001	Akinobu Nakabo	O3020.0269/P269	4001
24998	7590 12/02/2003		EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN 2101 L STRE	N SHAPIRO MORIN EET NW	PAIK, STEVE S		
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\			X
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/966,592	NAKABO, AKINOBU	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven S. Paik	2876	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply the places the application	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing da	<u>-</u>		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).	e later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	ng date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appro originally set in the final C	priate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	pecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of t	finally rejected claims	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: S	or reconsideration has been cons ee Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	· ·		
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

SUPERVISORY PATENT EX

TECHNOLOGY CENTER \$800

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Remarks and Arguments have been fully considered. However, the Argument is not persuasive. The cited prior arts of record, leda (US 5,847,371) and Yasuma et al. (US 4,839,509) taken alone or in combination with the other, disclose or fairly suggest an IC card device communicating with an IC card. The device comprises the limitations recited in the present claims.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 1-20 remain rejected as set forth in the Final Office action (see paper No. 8).